REMARKS

In the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, the Examiner objected to the key limitation added by amendment to all main claims in the previous response of "enabling a display of a status of the other separately-executing program in the graphical display area of said browser" as not being supported in the patent specification as originally filed. Based on the numerous examples from the original text cited in our previous response, the Examiner interprets the recited function as "enabling a display of an effect of the executing program in the graphical display area of said browser while the user continues to employ said browser". The Examiner's interpretation is deemed by the Applicant to be similar in effect to what was intended by the previous terminology. Therefore, the Examiner's suggestion of "enabling display of an effect" as the proper terminology is herein adopted in place of the previous "status" terminology in main Claims 1, 6, 47, 56, and 85 and relevant depending claims for consistency therewith.

With the above interpretation, the Examiner takes the position that the previously cited Estabrook reference, page 132, Figs. 9.4 and 9.5, discloses enabling a display of an effect of a separately-executing program in the display of the browser. However, the separately-executing program the Examiner cited in Estabrook is the History Frame function of the browser. It is well known in the relevant industry that the History Frame used in a browser is a browser function, not a separately-executing program. Therefore, it appears that the Examiner's interpretation of the History Frame of the browser as a separately-executing program in the Estabrook prior art is deemed to be incorrect and improperly applied against the limiting term "enabling a display of an effect of the other separately-executing program in the graphical display area of said browser" as now defined in the presently amended claims.

Therefore, the Examiner's grounds for rejection based on the Estabrook mention of the History Function of the browser is deemed to be incorrect and should be withdrawn. Main

Claims 1, 6, 47, 56, and 85 are therefore deemed to be patentably distinct over the cited Estabrook prior art. The other depending claims continue to depend from the main Claims 1, 6, 47, 56 and 85, respectively, and are deemed to be patentable for the same reason presented above. Accordingly, the Application and Claims 1, 5, 6, 8-36, 38-63, and 79-88 are now deemed to be in condition for allowance, and it is requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued upon reconsideration.